Remarks

Preliminary Matters

Claims 2-4, 8-10 and 27 are presented for reconsideration. Claims 1, 5-7 and 11-26 have been canceled. Claim 27 has been amended. Claims 28-31 have been added.

All references to paragraph numbers are to those of the Official Publication hereof, US 2005/0096966 Al.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 8 and 27 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055695 (Mori), in view of J. Bailey, A. Poulovassilis and P. Wood: "An Event-Condition-Action Language for XML" (Pub. 2002) (Bailey), and further in view of H. Herbst, G. Knolmayer, T. Myrach and M. Schlesinger: "The specification of business rules: A comparison of selected methodologies" (Pub. 1994) (Herbst).

Claim 2 was rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Bailey in further view of Herbst and in further view of Parad, U.S. Patent No. 5,369,570 (Parad).

Claims 9-10 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Bailey in further view of Herbst and in further view of Nye, U.S. Patent No. 6,341,279 (Nye).

The rejections were made final. The Examiner did not accept Applicant's arguments in response to the final rejection and issued an Advisory Action.

In this response Applicant augments the arguments previously made with a Declaration under Rule 132, submitted herewith, in order to prove non-obviousness of the rejected claims.

New Claims

New independent claims 28 and 30 are directed to subject matter similar to claim 27, but add further limitations. These claims require that dependencies between business components be compound dependencies, composed of different dependency types. This feature, supported at paragraph [0069] of the Official Publication hereof, is lacking in the cited art.

Moreover, claims 28 and 30 recite that the recited situation awareness unit operate on temporal relationships among the events. Handling of temporal relations is disclosed, for example, in Table II, following paragraph [0032], describing complex events.

Dependent claims 29 and 31 are directed to specific different dependency types, mandatory and disjunctive dependencies, which are disclosed in paragraph [0069]. These dependency types are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Mandatory dependency is specifically defined. Disjunctive dependency is well understood in the field of the invention to refer to a dependency wherein an event E0 occurs if either an event E1 or an event E2 has occurred.

Concluding Matters

Claim 27 was amended to correct an antecedent.

It is believed that the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove are fully responsive to all the grounds of rejection and objections raised by the Examiner, and that the Application is now in order for allowance.

Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_/Suzanne Erez/_____

Suzanne Erez

Reg. No. 46,688

Phone No.1-888-260-5928

Date: January 5, 2010

IBM Corporation

Intellectual Property Law Dept.

P. O. Box 218

Yorktown Heights, New York 10598